

In this case, the Rule 4(m) service period expired on January 11, 2018. In an Order dated January 31, 2018, the Court directed plaintiff to provide adequate information such that Ryan Unknown could be identified and served. The Court also cautioned plaintiff that, in the absence

of good cause shown, his failure to provide the necessary information would result in the dismissal of his case against Ryan Unknown pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff's response was due to the Court on February 21, 2018. To date, however, he has filed nothing.


A plaintiff bears the burden of providing proper service information. *Lee v. Armontrout*, 991 F.2d 487, 489 (8th Cir. 1993). Here, plaintiff failed to sufficiently identify Ryan Unknown in the Amended Complaint, reasonable efforts to locate and serve him based upon the limited information plaintiff did provide were unsuccessful, and plaintiff failed to respond to the Court's January 31, 2018 Order. This case will therefore be dismissed, without prejudice, pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith.

Dated this 28th day of February, 2018.


RONNIE L. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE